DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 832 JC 730 169

TITLE	Further Development of Arkansas Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Arkansas State Dept. of Higher Education, Little Rock.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	43p.; Report to the Legislative Council, the 69th General Assembly and Governor Dale Bumpers
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; *Community Colleges; *Data Analysis; Educational Needs; *Feasibility Studies; Higher Education; *Junior Colleges; Post Secondary Education; Technical Reports; Universities; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Arkansas

ABSTRACT

A report is given to present a comprehensive analysis of the need for additional higher education in Arkansas, a coordinated approach which will best serve the needs of the state's citizens, and responses to resolutions calling for feasibility studies for community junior colleges. The report begins with a brief review of the history and role of higher education and coordination in higher education in Arkansas. An analysis and description of the need for expansion of higher educational opportunities in Arkansas is presented. Then four major options for expansion are discussed: (1) additional state colleges and universities, (2) branch campuses, (3) separate academic and technical institutions, and (4) community junior colleges. (Author/CK)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078832

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF ARKANSAS HIGHER EDUCATION

A Report to the Legislative Council,
The 69th General Assembly,
and
Governor Dale Bumpers
by
The State Board of Higher Education

Little Rock, Arkansas
July, 1972

JC 730 169

CONTENTS

Page

History of the Report ---------- 1

Higher Education and Its Coordination in Arkansas ---------- 2

The Need for Expansion of Higher Education in Arkansas ------ 4

Possible Sources for Expanded Higher Education ---------- 9

American Interest in Community Junior Colleges ---------- 21

Expanding Educational Opportunities through
Community Junior Colleges ---------- 22

Effects of Recommendations on Existing Institutions---------- 29

Response to Resolutions of 68th General Assembly:

Response to S.R. 41 by Hendrix ---------- 35
Response to S.C.R. 35 by Caldwell ---------- 36
Response to H.C.R. 51 by Courtney ---------- 37

Advisory Commission on
Community Junior Colleges ---------- Appendix

HISTORY OF THE REPORT

The 68th General Assembly, which met in 1971, reflected a widespread but uncoordinated public interest in expanded educational opportunities. Acts were passed to create one new two-year branch, several new state vocational-technical schools and the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges, which was charged to advise the State Board of Higher Education on the development of a community junior college system for Arkansas. Resolutions were passed calling for separate feasibility studies regarding community junior colleges and branches of existing four-year institutions.

This report, Further Development of Arkansas Higher Education, is in direct response to the resolutions calling for studies by the State Board of Higher Education. The purposes of this report are to present a comprehensive analysis of the need for additional higher education in Arkansas, a coordinated approach which will best serve the needs of the citizens of Arkansas, higher education in Arkansas, and the State of Arkansas, and responses to the resolutions calling for feasibility studies for community junior colleges and branches of existing institutions.

This report begins with a brief review of the history and role of higher education and coordination in higher education in Arkansas. An analysis and description of the need for expansion of higher educational opportunities in Arkansas is presented. Then four major options for expansion are discussed: (1) additional state colleges and universities, (2) branch campuses, (3) separate academic and

technical institutions, and (4) community junior colleges. Since community junior colleges have an important role to play, the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges and its recommendations are discussed, and the effects of these recommendations upon existing institutions are analyzed. The final sections of this report contain specific responses to S.R. 41, S.C.R. 35, and H.C.R. 51.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND ITS COORDINATION IN ARKANSAS

The history of public education in Arkansas dates back to 1871, when the Arkansas Industrial University, now known as the University of Arkansas, was founded. Arkansas A. M. & N. College was created in 1873. Over the decades since, several institutions have been started as agricultural high schools, junior colleges or normal institutes and then expanded to their present status. Most of the institutions were very small and very little direct state effort was spent in their coordination, funding or general supervision. However, as enrollments began to soar, the need for state coordination became obvious.

Arkansas state coordination efforts began in 1961 when the General Assembly established the Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance. Prior to this time each institutional president went to the Governor and the legislature to secure the funds he could for the operation and improvement of his particular college or university. This resulted in a scramble for funds and the persons who were strong politically usually secured the most funds for their institutions. For example, for years the four institutions which were created as agricultural high schools (Arkansas State University, University of Arkansas at Monticello, Southern State College, and Arkansas Polytechnic College)

received the same amount of appropriations even though none of them were the same size or offered the same programs.

Because of these inequities and the rising pressures of higher education, the Arkansas General Assembly and Governor Faubus felt the need to establish the first coordinating board for Arkansas higher Education. The Commission was composed of 10 laymen appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. A small professional staff was employed, and the first executive director was E. L. Angell. The primary responsibility of the Commission was to determine the financial needs of the institutions of higher education and to make these recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly. All of its recommendations were advisory since the Board of Trustees of each college and university is constitutional. In the beginning stages of the Commission, formulas to be utilized in arriving at a need for funds were developed by the staff with the assistance of advisory committees from the colleges and universities.

A couple of years after the establishment of the Commission, the legislature gave it more responsibility. This time it was directed to review each proposed bond issue of the institutions to determine its economic feasibility.

In 1965 the federal Congress passed the Higher Education Facilities Act. The legislature named the Commission as the state commission to administer this act. This program still exists and involves a grant program for academic buildings. In the beginning it also involved loans for buildings.

Included on the ballot for the November, 1964, general election was a proposed constitutional amendment which would allow the General Assembly to enact enabling legislation for community junior colleges. The Commission and its staff

had been first in recognizing the need for such institutions in Arkansas. This amendment passed, and legislation was enacted by the 1965 General Assembly which named the Commission the State Board for Community Junior Colleges.

The 1967 General Assembly appropriated $75,000 to the Commission and directed it to conduct a study of higher education and its needs and report its findings to the 1969 session. With these funds, the first comprehensive study of Arkansas higher education was conducted.

The 1971 General Assembly passed legislation which further strengthened the Commission. First, Act 38 of 1971 resulted in the complete reorganization of state government. This Act renamed the Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance as the Department of Higher Education. Act 287 of 1971 defined the functions and responsibilities of the new State Board of Higher Education. The State Board is still advisory, and its primary purpose is " . . . to promote a coordinated system of higher education in Arkansas, and to assure an orderly and effective development of each of the public-supported institutions of higher education."

It is in this role as the state agency responsible for the orderly development of public higher education in Arkansas that the State Board of Higher Education has developed this report.

THE NEED FOR EXPANSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN ARKANSAS

Is there a need for additional higher education opportunities in Arkansas? If so, what kinds of additional opportunities? These are very important questions. Certainly there is no need to re-trace the arguments for education of our

population. We all know that education is closely related to income, position, and satisfaction in our technological society.

The important question is how well Arkansas is delivering educational opportunity to her citizens. To answer this question, the 17 states surrounding and including Arkansas were surveyed to determine the kinds of educational opportunity offered and the numbers and percentages of students served by higher education. The results of this survey are presented in Table 1on the next page. The results do indicate a serious need for additional post-secondary educational opportunities in Arkansas.

Arkansas had 24.1% of its 18 - 24 age group enrolled in institutions of higher education in the fall of 1971. Among the 17 states in our region we ranked 15th. The average for the region was 31.2%. Based on the 1970 Census, which showed 211,056 Arkansans between the ages of 18 and 24, we were 15,000 Arkansans below the average in higher education enrollment.

What caused this shortage of 15,000 students? Primarily the shortage is in community junior colleges. Arkansas had only 1.2% of its 18 - 24 age group in community junior colleges compared to the region's 8.0%. This shortage of community junior college enrollment is itself nearly Arkansas's total enrollment shortage -- 14,400 students. In public senior colleges our 19.1% of the 18 - 24 age group enrolled exceeded the region's 17.4%. In private colleges our 3.8% of the 18 - 24-year-olds was below the region average of 5.8% by 4,200 students.

From this data three things become clear: (1) that Arkansas has a serious shortage of higher education enrollment, (2) that the shortage of enrollment is primarily in community junior colleges, and (3) that Arkansas compares

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE 18-24 AGE GROUP SERVED
BY STATE 1971

	Private	CJC	Public 4-Year Colleges	Total
Alabama	4.2	6.1	17.0	27.3
Arkansas	3.8	1.2	19.1	24.1
Florida	6.5	23.9	11.9	42.3
Georgia	4.2	2.9	14.6	21.7
Kansas	3.9	7.6	25.7	37.2
Kentucky	4.5	2.7	17.8	25.0
Louisiana	4.5	1.4	24.2	30.1
Maryland	6.9	10.4	18.2	35.5
Mississippi	3.4	13.3	17.3	34.0
Missouri	9.8	7.6	18.3	35.7
North Carolina	7.3	10.0	12.8	30.1
Oklahoma	6.2	5.9	26.7	38.8
South Carolina [a]	6.7	0.0	14.7[a]	21.4[a]
Tennessee [b]	7.4[b]	1.4[b]	18.4[b]	27.2[b]
Texas	5.5	11.0	18.0	34.5
Virginia	4.7	5.8	13.9	24.4
West Virginia	5.8	1.7	24.6	32.1
AVERAGE of All States Combined	5.8	8.0	17.4	31.2

(a) Includes enrollment at 13 new technical education centers
(b) Enrollment data for 1968

favorably with the states in this region in senior college enrollment.

How do educational opportunities need to be expanded? Additional options, free access colleges, occupational education, community service education, and general adult education are all needed in Arkansas.

At the present time in Arkansas, only two types of public post-secondary education are available to any great extent: academic programs at public senior colleges and universities and occupational programs at state vocational-technical schools. Additional options are needed. Only 69% of the Arkansas young people graduate from high school now. Worse, only 42.8% of the graduates go to college. Therefore, only 30% of Arkansas young people the age to enter higher education actually do so.

State vocational-technical schools do not reach a large percentage of the young people either. In the Arkansas State University report, Arkansas High School Graduates, 1971, we see that only 4.2% of the 1971 high school graduating classes enrolled in the state vocational-technical schools. Certainly the state vocational-technical schools are not limited to serving the recent high school graduates. However, since only 4.2% of the high school graduates in 1971 received occupational or career education from public institutions, there seems to be a need for additional career education opportunities. Arkansas needs more and different options in higher education.

In the report, Free Access Higher Education, written by Warren W. Willingham, Arkansas is shown to have a very low proportion of the population served by free access institutions. The study has a very careful and detailed definition of free access education that includes mileage to the institutions, cost,

selectivity of admissions, and institutional purpose. By the criteria used, in the 1960's, Arkansas had 30% of her white population within commuting distance of free access institutions. This is well below the average of 48% for the United States. In fact, Arkansas ranked 39th among the 50 states and 15th among the 16 Southern states.

At this time only four of the 10 counties with the largest population contain free access institutions. Arkansas needs institutions with low costs that are not selective in admissions and that are located close to most of the population.

Occupational education is one of the greatest needs in Arkansas. In the fall of 1971 only 4.2% of the high school graduates from the previous spring were enrolled in state vocational-technical schools as previously cited from Arkansas High School Graduates, 1971. Certainly occupational programs should be designed to serve more types of students than recent high school graduates. However,this 4.2% attendance rate among the 1971 graduates indicates that the occupational education needs of Arkansas are not met by the existing 15 state vocational-technical schools. Arkansas needs expanded occupational or career education opportunities.

Community service and general adult education programs are needed in Arkansas. It is difficult to know exactly how much of this type of educational service is being provided and how much unfulfilled need exists. However,in the widely varied community service programs run by the two existing community junior colleges, the enrollments are large. At the state vocational-technical schools, where special occupationally related courses are offered, the enrollments in these part-time courses are also relatively large.

In a time when technology is changing so rapidly, citizens of all ages need access to a wide variety of educational opportunities of shorter duration than a year or a semester. Likewise, in a time when people have the spare time for hobbies and avocations, these educational opportunities should be offered. Finally, general education programs are needed to serve the 31% of the population not now graduating from high school.

POSSIBLE SOURCES FOR EXPANDED HIGHER EDUCATION

Since Arkansas needs to broaden educational options, increase career or occupational education and provide adult and continuing education, what additional educational institutions are needed? There are four types of institutions which should be considered: (1) additional state colleges and universities, (2) branch campuses of existing state colleges and universities, (3) separate academic and technical institutions, and (4) community junior colleges. Before one option is selected, all should be considered and discussed.

1) Senior colleges and universities are obviously a very important segment of higher education in Arkansas. In fall of 1971, 42.8% of the 1971 Arkansas high school graduates enrolled in public and private senior colleges and universities. Since 69% of their age group graduated from high school, this was 30% of the age group that should have graduated from high school. Questions and problems: senior colleges become highly specialized at the upper division level and cannot be spread about the state widely enough to be within commuting distance of all students unless very expensive inefficiency can be afforded. Also, these institutions serve a minority of the population. They do not serve the 57% of the

graduates that do not go to college. Furthermore, as presently constituted, these institutions do not seem to be appropriate sites for the increased emphasis on occupational education that our society demands since they and their faculties are interested in baccalaureate programs and not shorter, less academic career or occupational programs.

One specific problem should be discussed. The number of high school graduates will not continue to increase dramatically as it has over the last few years, and there is serious concern on the part of these institutions that competition from other institutions or types of institutions will decrease their enrollments and harm their institutions. Obviously, unless many additional Arkansans can be served, additional institutions do not benefit the state or the existing senior colleges.

One cannot expect the total higher education enrollment in Arkansas to be dramatically increased through senior colleges and universities. In the survey of the 17 states from this region surrounding and including Arkansas, which is reported in Table 1 on page 6, this becomes clear. The senior colleges and universities in Arkansas already serve a very respectable 19.1% of the 18 - 24 age group. This is more than the percentage served in most states in the region. Indeed, if the states are grouped into the five with the highest total college-going rate and the five with the lowest total college-going rate, it is seen that Arkansas still compares favorably in terms of senior college and university enrollment. These two groups of states are shown in Table 2 on the following page. The five states with the highest percentage of 18 - 24-year-olds in college average 20.2% of this age group enrolled in senior colleges and universities. This compares favorably to Arkansas's 19.1% figure. It is interesting to note that among the five states in

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF STATES WITH
HIGHEST AND LOWEST TOTAL PERCENTAGES SERVED 1971

	Private	CJC	Public 4-Year Colleges	Total
Highest				
Florida	6.5	23.9	11.9	42.3
Oklahoma	6.2	5.9	26.7	38.8
Kansas	3.9	7.6	25.7	37.2
Missouri	9.8	7.6	18.3	35.7
Maryland	6.9	10.4	18.2	35.5
AVERAGE	6.7	11.1	20.2	38.0
Lowest				
South Carolina	6.7	0.0	14.7	21.4
Georgia	4.2	2.9	14.6	21.7
Arkansas	3.8	1.2	19.1	24.1
Virginia	4.7	5.8	13.9	24.4
Kentucky	4.5	2.7	17.8	25.0
AVERAGE	4.8	2.5	16.0	23.3

the region with the lowest percentages of 18 - 24-year-olds in college, the average percentage served in senior colleges and universities is 16.0%, a figure not too different from the 20.2% figure for the senior colleges and universities in the five states serving the largest total percentages. Between the five highest and the five lowest states in total percentage served, the difference of the percentages served by senior colleges and universities of 4.2% does not even begin to make up for the difference of 14.7% in the total percentages served.

All of this indicates that neither additional senior colleges and universities nor expansions of the present ones would be financially efficient methods for providing the expanded post-high school educational opportunities that are needed in Arkansas.

2) Branch campuses are one specialized variant of the senior college which offers only freshman and sophomore courses. Such an institution avoids the expense of higher cost upper level instruction. The most serious disadvantage of the branch campus is its specialization. Because of its relationship to a senior college, a branch campus is oriented only toward academic instruction. As discussed previously, this excludes a large proportion of the population.

There is a great deal of information which supports the argument that branch campuses are merely second priority, specialized extensions of senior college and university programs and will not provide the expansion of post-secondary education opportunities needed in Arkansas.

In the A.S.U. report, Arkansas High School Graduates, 1971, the college-going patterns for White county, the home of the only two-year branch campus in Arkansas, can be studied. White County had a total of 43.7% of its

1971 high school graduates attend college. This figure is very little better than the state average of 42.8%. Indeed, the 43.7% of the 1971 graduates attending college were composed of only 14.5% who attended a two-year college and a much larger 26.1% who attended an Arkansas senior college or university. Further, the 14.5% from White County who attended two-year institutions compares poorly with the 25.7% figure for Phillips County and the 37.6% figure for Sebastian County, the homes of the two community junior colleges in Arkansas.

Another source for information on the effectiveness of branch campuses is the survey of the 17 states adjoining and including Arkansas which was conducted by this department and reported in Table 1 on p. 6. There are three of the 17 states that have extensive systems of branch or university controlled junior colleges: Georgia, Kentucky, and South Carolina. The data for these states appears in Table 3 on the following page. All three of these states are in the five states with the lowest total college-going rates, and they average only 22.7% of the 18 - 24-year-olds enrolled in higher education. This average is even below that now existing in Arkansas. Even though the three states have from nine to 12 branch or university controlled campuses, they average only 1.9% of their 18 - 24-year-olds attending the institutions. For such a large number of institutions, this does not compare well at all with the 1.2% enrolled in the two existing community junior colleges in Arkansas. In fact, the low enrollments seem to correlate well with the small enrollment at the only two-year branch campus in Arkansas (484 students, fall, 1971.)

The available information indicates that branch campuses of senior colleges and universities, because they are so specifically transfer oriented and possibly

TABLE 3

PER CENT 18-24 AGE GROUP SERVED 1971
IN STATES WITH BRANCH OR UNIVERSITY CONTROLLED
COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

	Private	CJC	Public 4-Year Colleges	Total
Georgia	4.2	2.9	14.6	21.7
Kentucky	4.5	2.7	18.8	25.0
South Carolina	6.7	0.0	14.7	21.4
AVERAGE	5.1	1.9	15.7	22.7

because they are secondary interests of the larger parent institutions, cannot be expected to provide the expanded post-secondary educational opportunities which Arkansas needs.

3) Vocational-technical schools are institutions which perform an important function in our society. The need for occupational education by greater and greater proportions of our population becomes more and more obvious with the passage of time. Sidney P. Marland, United States Commissioner of Education, is regularly quoted stating that only 20% of future jobs will require baccalaureate programs and that 80% will require specialized skill.

Specialized vocational-technical schools consider it an advantage to be protected from encroachment by academically oriented administrators and faculty members. However, this separateness is also one of occupational education's biggest problems. Since only occupational programs are offered at state vocational-technical schools, and since many people view occupational education as "second class," these institutions become widely viewed as "second class." The condition feeds on itself. Viewed as second class, some parts of society will not use these schools. This, then, tends to limit the types of students who attend, and in turn, reinforce the idea that the schools are for "second class" people.

Significantly, enrollment figures showing the number of individuals actually enrolled at any one time in a given state vocational-technical school are difficult to acquire. We do not know precise enrollments at these schools at any one time, and we cannot make a comparison of 4,651 full-time enrollments that occurred at some time during the 1970-71 year in one of the 13 institutions then existing and

the 475 students enrolled full time in occupational programs on the third Monday of classes at the two community colleges in the fall of 1970. At least it is clear that the enrollment in occupational programs at the community colleges is comparable to the enrollment in occupational programs at the specialized institutions.

The best direct comparison of the effectiveness of state vocational-technical schools in enrolling and serving students seems to be the A.S.U. report, Arkansas High School Graduates, 1971. According to this study, which included 93% of the Arkansas high schools, only 4.2% of the 1971 high school graduating classes attended state vocational-technical schools in the fall of 1971. This 4.2% represents only 1,012 of the 23,865 graduates in this survey.

By way of comparison, the study shows 1,012 of the 23,865 1971 high school graduates attending the state vocational-technical schools and 604 attending the two community junior colleges. Certainly, this comparison is not meant to imply that the state vocational-technical schools should or do serve only recent high school graduates. However, little comparable enrollment information is available and the low percentage of high school graduates attending these institutions does give some indication of the problem involved in attempting to expand post-secondary educational opportunities to any great extent through state vocational-technical schools.

4) Community junior colleges offer the programs available at all of the other three types of institution. The one exception being that upper level instruction in academic programs is not available. It does not seem economically feasible to offer highly specialized upper division programs at institutions designed to serve a small geographical area.

The greatest single advantage that the community junior college offers Arkansas is that this type of institution can produce an immediate, large increase in percentages of Arkansans receiving post-secondary education. The survey of the 17 states in our region reported in Table 1, p. 6, indicates that the community junior college can be expected to produce an immediate expansion of educational opportunity. Another detailed study of the Arkansas experience in the creation of Phillips County Community College also indicates that the community junior college does produce an immediate expansion of educational opportunity.

Table 4 on the following page shows this impact of Phillips County Community College which was established in 1966. In 1965, the year before this college opened, 454 people from this county attended any institution of higher education in Arkansas. This 454 people represented 25.4% of the high school graduates for that county for the last four years. For the whole state of Arkansas 39.1% of the high school graduates for the last four years were enrolled.

In six years the college-going increased dramatically. In the fall of 1971, 1,273 people from Phillips County attended institutions of higher education in Arkansas. Of those 1,273 people, 532 attended colleges other than Phillips County Community College, and 741 attended the new community junior college. In just six years this college had more than doubled the number of people in its county who went to college. Further, while the college-going doubled, more people went to colleges outside the county than before. Where a total of 25.4% went off to college in 1965, 58.2% attended college in 1971. Where 25.4% went to colleges outside the county in 1965, 24.3% were still going outside the county in 1971. The college had produced an immediate, large increase in percentages

TABLE 4

THE IMPACT OF A NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE

(All Data Based on Phillips County, Arkansas, Residents)

	1965	PCCC Began Opr 1966[b]	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
College Going Rate (CGR), all Arkansas Colleges [a]	25.4	36.2	37.1	40.4	49.0	52.3	58.2
College Going Rate, all except CJC [a]	25.4	24.0[b]	24.0	23.0	24.1	22.3	24.3
College Going Rate, PCCC [a]	----	12.2	13.1	17.4	24.9	30.0	33.9
Total Attendance:							
All Institutions	454	688	764	876	1,052	1,179	1,273
All Except CJC	454	456[b]	494	499	517	503	532
Private	49	51[b]	63	55	60	53	58
Public	405	405	431	444	457	450	474
Total Attendance: [c]							
ASU	88	89	93	86	76	67	90
U of A	80	73	82	94	98	100	105
PCCC [d]	--	232	270	377	535	676	741
SCA	32	41	33	26	36	38	63
AM & N	162	161	188	200	203	191	163
High School Graduates Last 4 Years	1,783	1,903	2,061	2,171	2,149	2,254	2,189

(TABLE 4)

(a) The CGR (College Going Rate) is the number of Arkansas students in a given category divided by the total number of high school graduates for the preceding four years in that same category.

(b) Data for 1966 does not include Little Rock University and Harding College since both did not have enrollment available by county of origin.

(c) The institutions reported are all of those with sizeable numbers of students from Phillips County.

(d) Phillips County Community College first enrolled students in Fall, 1966.

of county residents receiving post-secondary education.

The community junior college has much greater flexibility than any other type of institution. Students have the opportunity to move from one program to another within a single institution. The economic advantages of the community junior college are great because administration and general overhead can be spread over several different types of instruction, thereby decreasing instructional cost. It is less expensive to have one unified institution than, for instance, to have a technical institute and a branch campus side by side with duplicated administrative records, financial aid, and similar services. The expense and inconvenience of building duplication or coordination of building use between separate institutions is minimized.

The community junior college can do more to popularize occupational education. All students at this institution are "in college"! The counseling staff has the opportunity to work with students needing occupational programs who would never go to the trade school. The flexibility of the institution encourages students to shift programs until they find one that "fits" them.

That the community junior colleges can and do fulfill the need for career or occupational education is best testified to by enrollments of 570 in career or occupational programs and 250 in community service programs at Westark Community College and by enrollments of 228 in career or occupational programs and 272 in community service programs at Phillips County Community College on the third Monday of classes in the fall of 1971.

Great obstacles to the expansion of educational opportunities in Arkansas through community junior colleges are the fears and concerns of the existing

colleges and universities that the colleges would simply divide the same number of students among more institutions and the opposition of existing state vocational-technical school personnel who fear that occupational and career education will not have sufficient emphasis when included in a comprehensive institution. Since the conclusion of this report is that community junior colleges offer the best vehicle for expanding post-secondary education in Arkansas, the impact of community junior colleges on other types of institutions will be specifically considered at a later point in the report.

AMERICAN INTEREST IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

The federal government has shown a serious interest in expanding higher education through community junior colleges. Federal funding for higher education, which began to increase dramatically after the first Sputnik was launched in the late 50's, has continually placed more and more emphasis upon community junior colleges until the Higher Education Bill of 1972, S659, which has been so much in the news lately. This bill provides for heavy emphasis upon community junior colleges. There are funds for heavily increased student financial aid, special veterans programs, further development of state occupational education programs through community junior colleges, and creation of new and expansion of existing community junior colleges.

The federal emphasis and the general public acceptance of community junior colleges is also evident in the large increases both in numbers of community junior colleges and in students enrolled in community junior colleges. Since the fall of 1963, community junior colleges have been opening at the rate of one

per week in America,and the enrollment has tripled from 927,537 to 2,680,762 in fall, 1971. Where there were 694 junior colleges in the fall of 1963, there were 1,111 in 1971. Unfortunately, Arkansas has not participated in this great expansion of educational opportunity through community junior colleges to the extent that most of America has.

EXPANDING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

Because community junior colleges seemed to many to be the best way to significantly expand educational opportunities in Arkansas, the 68th General Assembly authorized the creation of the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges. The State Board of Higher Education established the Advisory Commission, and the Governor appointed the members.

The 12 members of the Advisory Commission include a wide variety of Arkansans who are broadly representative of the many types of people who make up Arkansas. Their names are listed in an appendix to this report. They have devoted many hours to the development of 25 recommendations which are reported and explained in the report, Arkansas's Need for Community Junior Colleges.

The 25 recommendations were formally submitted to the State Board of Higher Education by the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges in its meeting on May 10, 1972. Two days later, on May 12, 1972, the State Board of Higher Education endorsed the 25 recommendations and recommended to the Governor and the General Assembly that a system of community junior colleges be developed in accord with the recommendations.

This action of the State Board is not sudden. Its history dates back many years. It dates back to 1961, when the Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance was founded to give Arkansas higher education better coordination. From the very beginning, E. L. Angell, the first executive director, recognized the need for community junior colleges in Arkansas. Then, on February 7, 1964, the Arkansas Legislative Council adopted Resolution No. 7, which was the request for the Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance to make a study of the possible need for a system of community junior colleges in Arkansas. The reply by the Commission to this request was submitted on October 10, 1964, in a report entitled, Report on the Need for a State System of Community Junior Colleges. As a result of this report, the voters of the state passed what became Amendment No. 52 to the Arkansas Constitution.

This constitutional amendment authorized the General Assembly to enact legislation providing for the establishment of junior college districts. It further stated that the General Assembly should describe the method of financing for community junior colleges and stated that it may authorize the levy of a tax upon the taxable property within the district. It also provided that the two-year community colleges could never become four-year institutions.

Enabling legislation was enacted by the 1965 General Assembly with the passage of Act 560. This act provides for community colleges with comprehensive courses of study, local control and some local support. It also sets procedures for financing, methods of establishment and requirements for creation of community junior colleges. The community college district is required to provide total capital outlay funds for land, construction, and initial equipment.

This is done through the issuing of bonds which are liquidated by district property tax. The act, as it passed in 1965, provided that the state would participate in operational expenditures at approximately one-third of the total cost. The act was amended in 1969 for the state's portion of operating funds to be between one-third and one-half. The law sets minimum standards for establishment of a community junior college district. The four basic criteria which must be met are: to insure adequate site size, sufficient number of students, sound levels of local tax support, and proper district size to permit the commuting of students.

Two institutions have been created under the provisions of the 1965 legislation. The voters of Phillips County gave a majority vote on October 23, 1965, for the establishment of Phillips County Community College. Sebastian County voters did the same on November 1, 1965. The Phillips County institution is located between Helena and West Helena on 65 acres of land. It is presently housed in a completely new campus, but it opened in the fall of 1966 in an old Naval Reserve building.

The Sebastian County institution, Westark Community College, was a private two-year college prior to 1965. Several new buildings have been constructed since it became a state-supported community college, and enrollments continue to climb.

While these two community junior colleges have grown and developed so well that their home counties now have the highest percentages of their 18 - 24 age population enrolled in education of all the counties in Arkansas, the expansion of community junior colleges throughout the state has not been successful. Elections to create community junior colleges in Garland and Mississippi Counties

have failed. Other counties have studied community junior colleges and not proceeded because the required millage would be too difficult to pass in this day of voter opposition to property taxes.

Other efforts have been made to expand educational opportunities in Arkansas. Many counties have worked to get state vocational-technical schools since no local cost is involved. This movement now seems to be slowing since federal funds to support these schools are becoming harder and harder to get. Similarly, the last session of the General Assembly saw one bill to create a fully state supported branch campus pass. The dam having been broken, resolutions were passed regarding the creation of at least four fully state supported two-year colleges.

With so much educational need and interest evident, it was time for the needs of the State of Arkansas to be reassessed and a coordinated response to the needs developed. It is the conclusion of the State Board of Higher Education that the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges represent the most desirable solution to Arkansas's needs for additional higher education opportunities.

The 25 recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges are:

1) The State of Arkansas should develop a statewide system of public comprehensive community junior colleges as soon as possible.

2) A comprehensive community junior college should be provided within daily commuting distance of all areas of the state.

3) The Board of Higher Education should endorse the master plan for the establishment of a system of community junior colleges in

Arkansas and recommend to the Governor and General Assembly that it be implemented.

4) The community junior college system at the state level should remain under the direction of the Board of Higher Education within the legal framework of Act 560 of the 1965 General Assembly (an act authorizing the establishment of community junior colleges.) The Board of Higher Education must determine if the proposed district meets minimum financial and population criteria and must grant final approval before a district can be formed.

5) To meet the needs of as many students as possible as rapidly as possible, new community junior colleges should be opened in temporary facilities; however, at the time a district is formed, adequate millage should be voted to assure adequate permanent facilities.

6) Each community junior college should have an "open door" admissions policy. Any high school graduate or any person over eighteen years of age should be eligible for admission.

7) Each community junior college in Arkansas should offer education for transfer to the bachelor's degree program (university parallel), occupational education (vocational-technical), general education, developmental programs (remediation), continuing education (adult education), community services, and guidance and counseling. These programs should be offered in day, evening, and summer sessions. Associate degrees should be awarded to students who satisfactorily complete two-year curricula and appropriate certificates to students who complete other curricula.

8) Student fees at community junior colleges should be kept to a minimum. The fee schedule for the state's community junior colleges should be set by the Board of Higher Education. Consideration should be given to reducing the out-of-district fee currently provided for in Act 560.

9) The state should provide funds for the general operation of the educational program of each college and the local community junior college district should be responsible for all construction, renovation and repair of facilities.

10) If a community junior college is established in a district where a state area vocational-technical school now exists, the two should be combined into a comprehensive community junior college. The local board should study the feasibility of placing the college facilities near the existing area school. The director and staff of the area

school, under the direction of the president and board of the college, should operate the vocational-technical division of the new entity.

11) Additional state area vocational-technical schools should not be located within a community junior college district.

12) Community junior colleges should share their vocational-technical facilities and equipment with local high schools. During periods when these facilities are not being used by college students, they should be made available for use by nearby high schools.

13) Since community junior colleges have proven to be most successful in states where they are not under the administrative control of senior institutions, community college affiliation with state colleges or universities should be discouraged.

14) Full transfer rights should be provided qualified students of community colleges by state colleges and universities. A committee composed of both community college and senior college representation should be appointed by the Board of Higher Education to study problems of articulation which may arise as the community junior college system develops.

15) Each community junior college should number its courses so that four-year institutions will be able to identify courses proposed for transfer.

16) Special training should be provided in the graduate programs of the state's two universities for the preparation of community junior college instructors and administrators.

17) Each Arkansas community junior college should, as soon as possible, apply for membership in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

18) The president of each of these institutions should be committed to the educational purposes of the comprehensive community junior college.

19) Community junior colleges should be designated as area health education centers to provide training for allied health personnel.

20) Certain provisions contained in Act 560 of the 1965 General Assembly, as amended, have proven desirable and should be continued. They are as follows:

a) The provisions insuring local control

b) The provisions that a community junior college district may be dissolved and the millage tax repealed only upon approval by a majority of the qualified electors of said district

c) The procedures for the issuance of bonds

d) The provision prohibiting the construction of dormitories

e) The provision limiting the participation in inter-collegiate athletics to basketball and spring sports

f) The minimum requirements for the establishment of a community junior college

21) An extensive public relations and information program should be launched to present the "community junior college story" to Arkansas citizens.

22) The Advisory Commission recognizes the potential for a community college in the following counties: Baxter, Benton, Boone, Garland, Jefferson, Mississippi, Pulaski, St. Francis, Sevier and Union. This information is forwarded to the State Board along with the recognition that these are not exclusive locations and that the Advisory Commission recognizes no priorities.

23) Where it is feasible, the Advisory Commission recommends that present State Vocational-Technical Schools be expanded and enlarged into comprehensive community junior colleges.

24) The staff of the Department of Higher Education should be charged with the responsibility of contacting the areas where there is a recognized need and working with any additional areas that are interested in establishing a community junior college. If additional staff is needed, it should be provided.

25) The State Board of Higher Education should request appropriations of $2,500,000 for the first year of the next biennium and $3,000,000 for the second year of the next biennium to fund the operating cost of new community junior colleges to be established. Five new institutions should be established and funded during each of the next two biennia.

Since these recommendations outline a coordinated response, the resolutions for the studies of feasibility for the establishment of state supported two-year colleges in various locations are responded to in accord with the recommendations as directed by the State Board of Higher Education in its resolution on Agenda Item No. 3 at the May 12, 1972, meeting.

EFFECTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON EXISTING INSTITUTIONS

How will a system of community junior colleges affect existing institutions of higher education in Arkansas? This recommended system of community junior colleges is to extend educational opportunities to people not now served. It will not have a measurable effect on the public senior colleges or the private schools now operating in Arkansas.

The study of the 17 states surrounding and including Arkansas shows this. The states with the highest percentage of the 18 - 24 age group in college, Florida, Oklahoma, Kansas, Missouri and Maryland, average 38% of their 18 - 24 age group in college. (See Table 2, p. 11.) Of this 38% in college, 20.2% are in public senior colleges, 11.1% in community junior colleges, and 6.7% in private institutions.

In the states with the lowest percentage of the 18 - 24 age group in college, South Carolina, Georgia, Arkansas, Virginia, and Kentucky, the average is 23.3% of the 18 - 24 age group in college. Of this 23.3% in college, 16.0% are in public senior colleges, 2.5% in community junior colleges, and 4.8% in private institutions. Notice that while there are 14.7 percentage points difference in the total percentage served, there are only 4.2 points difference in public senior colleges. There is a much larger 8.6% difference in community junior colleges. This 8.6%

is more than half of the total 14.7% shortage. Notice also that the private schools do better in the states where the community junior colleges and the public senior college enrollment is higher.

In general this data indicates that community junior college enrollment is in addition to senior college, university, and private enrollment. To make the most extreme test, the data from the 17 states surrounding and including Arkansas was arranged in another way for analysis. The data for the five states with the highest and lowest percentages of 18 - 24-year-olds in community junior colleges was grouped together in Table 5 on the next page. This is not exactly a fair comparison since, in many cases, states have chosen to emphasize one type of institution rather than another, and this factor could tend to accentuate differences. However, even in this extreme test, the community junior college enrollment does not seem to have too much relationship to senior college and private enrollment.

The five states with the greatest percentages of 18 - 24-year-olds enrolled in community junior colleges averaged 5.9% in private colleges, 13.7% in community junior colleges, and 15.6% in public senior colleges for a total of 35.3% of the 18 - 24-year-olds in higher education.

The five states with the lowest percentages of 18 - 24-year-olds enrolled in community junior colleges averaged 5.6% in private colleges, only 1.1% in community junior colleges, and 20.2% in public senior colleges for a total of 27.0%.

Notice that between the two groups there is a difference of 8.3% in total percentage of 18 - 24-year-olds in college and a difference of 12.6% in percentage attending community junior colleges. Note, however, that there is slightly better enrollment at private colleges where community junior colleges exist. Note also

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF STATES WITH
HIGHEST AND LOWEST PERCENTAGES SERVED
IN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES 1971

	Private	CJC	Public 4-Year Colleges	Total
Highest				
Florida	6.5	23.9	11.9	42.3
Mississippi	3.4	13.3	17.3	34.0
Texas	5.5	11.0	18.0	34.5
Maryland	6.9	10.4	18.2	35.5
North Carolina	7.3	10.0	12.8	30.1
AVERAGE	5.9	13.7	15.6	35.3
Lowest				
South Carolina	6.7	0.0	14.7	21.4
Arkansas	3.8	1.2	19.1	24.1
Louisiana	4.5	1.4	24.2	30.1
Tennessee	7.4	1.4	18.4	27.2
West Virginia	5.8	1.7	24.6	32.1
AVERAGE	5.6	1.1	20.2	27.0

that there is a difference of only 4.6% in senior college enrollments between the two groups of states. Clearly the small difference in public senior college enrollments is more than justified by the tremendous difference in number educated in community junior colleges.

In the less extreme case cited earlier, Arkansas is at the average in percentage of 18 - 24 age group served in public senior colleges and well below the average in community junior college enrollments. (Table 1, p. 6) It seems that an increase of 14,000 to 15,000 (8%) in number of 18 - 24-year-olds enrolled in community junior colleges could be brought about with almost no effect on existing colleges and universities.

There is another source of data on the effect of a community junior college on existing institutions: the study of college-going patterns in Phillips County before and after Phillips County Community College was created. (Table 4, p. 18) In 1965, the year before Phillips County Community college was started, 454 people from that county attended colleges in Arkansas. This was 25.4% of the four-year moving total of high school graduates. Phillips County Community College more than doubled this rate by 1971, when 58.2% of the four-year moving total of high school graduates from that county were enrolled in higher education in Arkansas. It is also significant that in 1971, 532 people from Phillips County attended Arkansas colleges other than their community college. The 532 is 24.3% of the four-year moving total. Compare 454 people in 1965 to 532 people in 1971 who left that county for college. Compare 25.4% in 1965 to 24.3% in 1971 who left that county for college. This insignificant drop of only one percentage point in people leaving that county to attend college must be compared to the 741 from that

county who enrolled at Phillips County Community College. This 741 at Phillips County Community College is itself 33.9% of the four-year moving total for that county and more than the total rate in 1965. In other words, Phillips County Community College more than doubled college-going in that county while college-going to other institutions held constant.

Based on the data collected regarding Phillips County Community College, it is not difficult to predict the number that would probably have attended college if the new community junior college had not been created. Comparing this number to the number still going off to other institutions and to the number then enrolled at Phillips County Community College, it can be reliably estimated that in 1971, 93% of the Phillips County Community College enrollment were people who would not have gone to college otherwise.

Establishment of a state community junior college system would have impact on state vocational-technical schools. Several state vocational-technical schools would be expanded into community junior colleges if the recommendations of the State Board of Higher Education and the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges were followed. The concept behind the recommendations is a state system of comprehensive institutions which offer a student flexibility through a wide variety of programs and which are more economical because of usage of one plant, administration and faculty to perform several jobs. Therefore, Recommendation No. 10 specifically calls for the combination of community junior colleges and state vocational-technical schools wherever both are located in the same county.

The proposal of a community junior college system for Arkansas does not

involve the conversion of all existing state vocational-technical schools. Only at the locations where a comprehensive community junior college is justified should one of these institutions be converted. There are a number of state vocational-technical schools located where the population and tax resources do not justify a community junior college.

The main concern should be the expansion of career or occupational education. The need for expanded opportunities in this area is so evident. Viewed in this light, career education would serve many more students if it were offered in a comprehensive community college where students who would not attend the isolated and specialized state vocational-technical schools would participate.

RESPONSE TO RESOLUTIONS OF 68TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1971

Being aware of the 15,000 Arkansans which we are below the average in post-high school education, having considered the alternative methods for increasing educational opportunity in Arkansas, and having determined that the development of community junior colleges would not seriously harm the existing institutions of higher education in Arkansas, the State Board of Higher Education endorses the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Community Colleges that would create a community junior college system and responds to the resolutions of the 68th General Assembly within the framework of these recommendations.

Response to S.R. 41 by Hendrix

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE SIXTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS:

That the Board of Trustees of Southern State College and the Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance are hereby directed to jointly make a comprehensive study of the need for, feasibility of, and benefits to be derived from the establishment at Hope, Hempstead County, Arkansas, of a community junior college, to be operated as a branch of said Southern State College. The report and recommendations of the Board of Trustees of Southern State College and the Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance resulting from said study shall be filed with the 1973 Regular Session of the General Assembly.

The staff of the Department of Higher Education and the administration of Southern State College have met and discussed this resolution several times. To a great extent, the Southern State College administration has relied on the staff of the Department of Higher Education. It should be specifically stated that while some discussion and study has been done jointly, the Board of Trustees of Southern State College has not been asked to endorse the recommendations of the State Board of Higher Education or the Advisory Council on Community Junior Colleges.

The State Board of Higher Education does not find it either desirable or feasible to establish a community junior college at Hope, Hempstead County, Arkansas, to be operated as a branch of Southern State College.

Reasons cited are:

1) Community junior colleges seem to grow and flourish to a much greater extent if they are not under the administrative control of senior colleges and universities.

2) A branch of Southern State College would be funded for both operation and construction costs from all state funds. The Board of Higher Education does not recommend total state support of building costs at community junior colleges.

3) Other educational facilities exist that mitigate against the state completely financing a community junior college at Hope, in Hempstead County. Red River State Vocational-Technical School is located in Hope. Texarkana Junior College, which charges Arkansas residents in-state tuition, is within 35 miles by Interstate 30. Henderson State College and Southwest Technical Institute are within 50 miles.

The State Board of Higher Education is not stating that it would automatically refuse permission for an election to create a community junior college at Hope under current law or under the new recommendations. It is recommending against a fully state funded community junior college as a branch of a senior college or university at Hope.

Response to S.C.R. 35 by Caldwell

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE SIXTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING THEREIN:

SECTION 1. The Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance is hereby requested to make a study of the feasibility of the establishment of junior college facilities in Benton County, Arkansas, and to report its findings and recommendations to the Sixty-Ninth General Assembly.

The staff of the Department of Higher Education and the members of the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges have studied the feasibility

of establishing a community junior college in Benton County, Arkansas. Staff members have met several times with citizens from Benton County at meetings both in Little Rock and Benton County.

The Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges, in Recommendation No. 22, recognized the potential for a community junior college in 10 counties, including Benton County. Under current community junior college law or with the recommended changes, the State Board of Higher Education would be pleased to receive an application for an election to create a community junior college in Benton County if that application were designed so as to meet the minimum requirements. Members of the State Board of Higher Education and the staff of the Department of Higher Education offer any assistance in developing an application for an election to create a community junior college in Benton County or any other county.

Response to H. C. R. 51 by Courtney

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SIXTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS, THE SENATE CONCURRING THEREIN:

SECTION 1. The Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance is hereby requested to make a study of the feasibility and desirability of the establishment of a branch of Arkansas State University at Forrest City, Arkansas, and to report its findings and recommendations to the Arkansas Legislative Council on or before July 1, 1972, in order that the Legislative Council may study the report of the Commission and make recommendations regarding the enactment of legislation to accomplish the purposes of its recommendations.

The staff of the Department of Higher Education and the members of the Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges have studied the feasibility

of establishing a branch of Arkansas State University or a community junior college in St. Francis County, Arkansas. Staff members have met several times with citizens from St. Francis County at meetings both in Little Rock and Forrest City.

The State Board of Higher Education does not find it desirable or feasible to establish a branch of A.S.U. at Forrest City.

Reasons cited are:

1) An academically oriented branch campus at Forrest City would not, in all probability, enroll more than a few hundred students and would not be a desirable or efficient operation.

2) Creation of a separate branch campus would duplicate some facilities already available at the existing State Vocational-Technical School. The other possibilities, which include joint use of facilities but separate control and merging of the vocational programs under the senior college branch, do not seem workable.

The Advisory Commission on Community Junior Colleges, in Recommendation No. 22 recognized the potential for a community junior college in 10 counties, including St. Francis County. Under current community junior college law or with the recommended changes, the State Board of Higher Education would be pleased to receive an application for an election to create a community junior college in St. Francis County if that application were designed so as to meet the minimum requirements. Members of the State Board of Higher Education and the staff of the Department of Higher Education offer any assistance in developing an application for an election to create a community junior college in St. Francis County or any other county.

APPENDIX

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES

MEMBERS

John W. Mann, Jr., Forrest City, Chairman

James M. Llewellyn, Jr., Lavaca, Vice Chairman

Senator Clarence E. Bell, Parkin

Dr. Joe D. Bennett, Harrison

Dr. Shelby Breedlove, Fort Smith

Dr. John Easley, Helena

Ben Grinage, Little Rock

Dr. Charles Kauffman, Fordyce

Robert Klaser, McGehee

Merle Peterson, Dumas

L. E. Tennyson, Smackover

Herman Udouj, Fort Smith

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ARKANSAS STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

MEMBERS

Howard Halthoff, Chairman
Gould

B. H. Lambert, Jr., Vice Chairman
West Memphis

Dr. Joe F. Rushton, Secretary
Magnolia

Mrs. Corbie M. Howard
Conway

Marlin Jackson
Paragould

[illegible] MacDonald
Brinkley

Charles H. Murphy, Jr.
El Dorado

Harry Ponder, Sr.
Walnut Ridge

Henry B. Shreve
Fayetteville

Jim Snoddy
Van Buren

STAFF

Dr. M. Ellis Cook
Director

Robert McCormack
Assistant Director for
Federal Programs &
Finance

Dr. Gary Chamberlin
Assistant Director

COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE DIVISION

[illegible] Assistant Director for
Community Junior Colleges

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 9 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION